

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 1, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,237,488 ("Moser") and rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moser. The Examiner objected to claims 2-6 and 8 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in dependent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-10, 12, 13 and 19 are pending in this application and claims 11, 14-18 and 20 have been withdrawn from consideration.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moser. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because Moser does not disclose each and every element set forth in claim 1, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 19, Moser cannot anticipate the hinge, or electronic device, recited in claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 19 of the present application.

Independent claim 1 recites a hinge having, *inter alia*, a body including a printed circuit board and a terminal extending from the printed circuit board, a contact member including a conductive contact and a contact sleeve, the contact member defining a passageway, wherein the terminal and at least a portion of the printed circuit board are positioned within the contact passageway.

In asserting that Moser anticipated claim 1, the Examiner characterized the hinge pin 30 as a circuit board. The Examiner then characterizes the electrical connector 42 as the terminal extending from the circuit board. However, the electrical connector 42 is a separate device that this mated to the hinge pin. To the extent there is a terminal on the hinge pin, it would be the conductive tracks 34, which do not extend from the circuit board. Rather, they appear to be located on an outer surface of the hinge pin. Thus, Moser does not disclose, teach or suggest a terminal extending from a circuit board.

Regarding the contact member, the Examiner has characterized the contacting wipers 44 of electrical connector 40 of Moser as the contact member. The Examiner further characterized the electrical connector 40 as the conductive contact, and characterized the hinge bore 32 as the contact passageway. Even if one were to accept these characterizations,

it is clear that the contacting wipers 44 (which has been characterized as the contact member) do not define a passageway as recited by the Examiner. Rather, the contacting wipers 44 are nothing more than contact pads on an outer surface of an electrical connector. Furthermore, the electrical connector 42 (characterized as the terminal) and at least a portion of the hinge pin 30 (characterized as the printed circuit board) are not disclosed in Moser as being located in the contacting wipers 44 (which has been characterized as the contact member, which defines the contact passageway). Thus, Moser does not disclose, teach or suggest a contact member defining a passageway, or the terminal and at least a portion of the printed circuit board positioned within the contract passageway, as recited in claim 1. Thus, for at least these reasons, Moser does not anticipate claim 1 of the present invention. Since claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 ultimately depend from claim 1, Moser likewise does not anticipate claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 for at least these same reasons.

Independent claim 19 recites an electronic device having, *inter alia*, a hinge, the hinge including, *inter alia*, a body including a printed circuit board and a terminal extending from the printed circuit board, a contact member including a conductive contact, the conductive contact defining a passageway, wherein the terminal is positioned within the contact passageway. As the Examiner has characterized the features of claim 19 in the same manner as the features of claim 1, claim 19 is likewise not anticipated by Moser for at least the same reasons that Moser does not anticipate claim 1. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 19 as being anticipated by Moser.

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moser. As claim 7 depends on claim 1, claim 7 is not obvious over Moser for at least the same reasons that Moser does not anticipate claim 1. As such, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 7 as being unpatentable over Moser.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conversation would facilitate the prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: August 26, 2005

By: Robert J. Zettler
Robert J. Zettler
Registration No. 37,973

Mailing Address:
MOLEX INCORPORATED
2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4884
Fax.: (630) 416-4962